



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The most interesting and instructive parts of the book treat mainly of Greek lands outside the beaten track of 'personally conducted' parties. The chapters on the various Ionian Islands and on the Maniats of southern Laconia are cases in point.

Father Quinn shows great interest, insight and fairness in his treatment of religious questions. The 'survivals' of ancient myth and ritual are continually indicated.

The brief but vivid account of the siege of Mesolonghi in the Greek Revolution is far superior in interest to the annalistic narrative of Howe, or to the scholarly but prosaic account of Finlay. It rather recalls the story of the novelist Xenos in his 'Andronike', translated by Grosvenor.

The most serious criticism to be passed upon Dr. Quinn's book grows out of his familiarity with the modern Greek pronunciation and his fondness for that pronunciation. This is a matter of the personal equation, of course, and it is within an author's technical right to use what are, to the readers to whom the book appeals, outlandish and repellent expressions, but *cui bono*?

In the first place, such a scheme is almost impossible of consistent execution, as Dr. Quinn's book abundantly proves. *Eu* in Greek names he regularly writes *ev*, thus giving us *Zeus*, *Elevisis*, *Peiraeceus*, and even *Akrokeraunian*, the last being an Anglicized form of a Latinized Greek word. Will Dr. Quinn tell us that this spelling represents any actual pronunciation of the English word at any period? Possibly *Elevisis* represents a some-time truth, but why not go to the length and use *Levsina* as the Greeks of today do? If we insist upon *Peiraeceus*, why not transliterate exactly and write *Peiraieus*? Dr. Quinn writes *Bathy* and *Bolos*, but *Omer Vrioni*; why not *V* in all if we are to indicate the modern sounds? *Phaeaks* (not *Phaiaks*) for our old friends the Phaeacians, *Evmolpids*, *Levktra*, all raise our ire, for they simply introduce a new element of confusion into the already sufficiently perplexing question of spelling and pronunciation. Many of these words are thoroughly Anglicized, and no one, it seems to us, is justified in thus making a bad matter worse. And if bad for the Greek student who can "see the point", how much worse for the non-Greek reader who needs a glossary of Quinnisms to get him back into his former world.

But this is Father Quinn's little fad, and we gladly forgive him for it, in view of the instruction and pleasure he has given us in Helladian Vistas.

GEORGE A. WILLIAMS.

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE

In sending you a brief rejoinder to Professor Greene's reply to my criticism of his paper upon Latin Word-Order, I would not occupy the position

of the proverbial woman who must have the last word, but I want to express regret for my slip in not noticing that *fiebat* and not *factus est* stands in the passage from Cicero's Milo, though, as Professor Greene suggests, the blunder does not invalidate my argument.

Will you spare me space for another remark or two? What Professor Greene says about the position of "the stronger or more significant word" seems to show that we mean different things by the term 'emphasis'. According to him these more significant words are *eo ipso* the more emphatic ones, while I hold that emphasis is quite independent of the connotative force of a word.

Again, Professor Greene says truly that 'we must note carefully the Latin form of expression'. It is on this account that it seems to me futile to try to settle any question of emphasis in Latin by setting before elocutionists unfamiliar with that language a literal translation of a Latin sentence. This might work if one could reproduce in English all the shadings of the thought in Latin sentences as well as one generally can those of the thought expressed in German or French or other modern languages, by translating nouns by nouns, verbs by verbs, adjectives by adjectives, etc. To deny emphasis to a Latin word because one would not emphasize its syntactical equivalent in an English sentence translated word for word from the Latin appears to me entirely unwarrantable.

I should like to show how such crude indications of emphasis as 'I am passing my FOUR and eightieth year', and 'But I come to the farmers, etc.', do not at all express the very slight degrees of emphasis which a Greenoughite sees in such sentences, but it would take too long, and your readers are doubtless weary of the subject already. I hope they will all read Professor Meader's article in The School Review for April.

NOTE

HORACE'S ESTIMATE OF HELIODORUS IN SERM. 1. 5. 3.

rhetor comes Heliodorus
Graecorum longe doctissimus.

The individual alluded to probably cannot now be identified. "The hyperbole is intended and is playful", comments Wickham. "Probably a friendly overestimate, as no account of him has come down to us with all his learning", observes Greenough. "An exaggerated expression characteristic of the mock-heroic style which Horace adopts in several parts of this satire, . . . a form of wit common in modern times", writes Rolfe. Among the multitude of similar comments on this passage, we may be surprised that what seems an obvious explanation is not emphasized, that Horace is speaking in bitter